

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is requested. By this amendment Applicants have amended claim 1 for clarity. Claims 1 and 2 remain in the case. Applicants also are sending a formal copy of the drawing Figs. 1-3.

The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Engholm et al ("Engholm"). In response to Applicants' previous arguments regarding Alexander the Examiner repeats the assertion that Alexander teaches in Fig. 3A and columns 7-9 that the waveform display region 302 is divided into ten "LONG" data records or divisions and a displayed waveform meets the claim limitation of "long data records." The Examiner further states that, although a single pulse waveform is displayed in Fig. 3A, any waveform with an arbitrary number of pulses from the digital oscilloscope 100 can be displayed and thus the cited reference teaches "the long data record" as a displayed waveform because any waveform meets the claim limitation of "long data record." The Examiner further asserts that Alexander teaches marker indicators encompassing the boundary of the rescaling rectangle and thus the rescaling rectangle is marked, i.e., a region of a waveform is marked and the marker around the waveform region spans the waveform regions and has at least a minimum width and length of the waveform region; that moreover the marker indicators along the boundary of the rescaling rectangle spans the width and may have a length of at least one pixel because the line is color-marked and color-marking requires the pixels along the line to be changed and thus the marker indicator along the boundary of the rescaling rectangle spanning the width having a length of at least one pixel to indicate the color changes when necessary (column 9, line 63 - column 10, line 7 and column 15, lines 45-50). The Examiner admits that Alexander does not explicitly disclose the minimum length of the associated marker sufficient to enable a user to readily point to it in order to select and manipulate the zoom region, but that Alexander may implicitly teach or at least suggest the claim limitation as Alexander teaches (column 15, lines 40-50) that the rescaling rectangle is user-created through the use of a cursor control device and the user may delineate the boundaries of the rescaling rectangle using marker indicators or

through the use of any other well-known graphical or other means, and that Alexander discloses that the user preferably invokes waveform scaling through the selection of an arbitrary point within the rescaling rectangle and a particular key stroke may be provided as a means for the user to communicate this selection (column 10, lines 40-50). The Examiner then goes on to state that Engholm explicitly discloses the minimum length of the associated marker sufficient to enable a user to readily point to it in order to select and manipulate the zoom region (Figs. 1-3) having a path marking the zoom rectangle and two symbols 18, 20 appear superimposed on the graphics display screen for zoom in/out of the marked rectangle of the waveform regions. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Engholm's teaching into Alexander because Alexander at least suggests the claim limitation; that Alexander teaches the marker indicators encompassing the boundary of the rescaling rectangle and thus the rescaling rectangle is marked, i.e., a region of a waveform is marked and the marker around the waveform region spans the waveform regions and has at least a minimum width and length of the waveform region; that Engholm teaches other claim limitations set forth in claim 1 including displaying the long data record as a display waveform (Figs. 1-3), displaying a portion of the displayed waveform defined by the zoom region as a zoomed waveform and manipulating the zoom region by moving the associated marker along the displayed waveform with a pointer device to display other portions of the displayed waveform (Figs. 1-3, column 2); and that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to easily allow the user to point to it to zoom the selected zoom rectangle (column 2, lines 5-28). Applicants respectfully traverse this improper and nonobvious combination suggested by the Examiner.

For further clarity Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the associated marker 50 is "independent" of the zoom region 48, which enables it to be any length "equal to or greater than the width of the zoom region" although generally it is "equal to" the width of the zoom region unless the zoom region 46 width is too narrow, i.e., "less than a specified dimension." Also Applicants have amended claim 1 to assure that both the displayed long data record waveform 32 and the zoomed

waveform 34, 36, 38 are displayed "simultaneously". These amendments are deemed to be implicit in the original claim, but are inserted for clarity. Applicants still submit that Alexander does not display a long data record waveform as previously argued, despite the Examiner's hindsight conclusions to the contrary, as Alexander does not show anything comparable to waveform 32 shown by Applicants in Fig. 3. A "long data length waveform" means, as is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, a waveform that has so much data that, when displayed in its entirety, details of the waveform are not discernable. Further neither Alexander (Figs. 3A and 3B) nor Engholm (Figs. 1-3) teach or suggest an independent associated marker having a length equal to or greater than the width of the zoom region. As argued previously Alexander (and Engholm) merely shows a zoom region, which has to be deleted and redrawn if a different portion of the displayed waveform is to be zoomed. Finally neither reference teaches or suggests that both waveforms (long data length waveform and zoomed waveform representing a portion of the long data length waveform) are displayed simultaneously. Thus claims 1 and 2 are deemed to be allowable as being nonobvious to one of ordinary skill in the art over Alexander in view of Engholm.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks allowance of claims 1 and 2 is urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT L. BEASLEY, ET AL.

By Thomas F. Lenihan
Thomas F. Lenihan
Reg. No. 32152
Attorney for Applicants

TEKTRONIX, INC.
P.O. Box 500 (50-LAW)
Beaverton, OR 97077
(503) 627-7266

7452-US1